



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/753,220

12/29/2000

Joshua Coates

SCAL.P0009

9346

7590

06/22/2006

CHRISTOPHER K. GAGNE
C/O BLAKLEY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

ELLIS, KEVIN L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2188

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Detailed Action

1. Claims 13-31 are presented for examination.
2. Information disclosed and listed on PTO 1449 has been considered.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(c) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 13-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cohen et al., U.S. Patent 6,389,462.

A) As to claims 13 and 29, Cohen et al. discloses the invention as claimed. Cohen et al. teaches system where when an object is requested a control node is selected to retrieve that object from a storage node and store the object in the control node. In response to subsequent requests for the same object a different control node may be selected, the number of control nodes storing a respective copy dependent on the number of requests for the object (see Fig 1, Col 6 Line 21 to Col 7 Line 48). Cohen teaches that when a client requests an object the request is sent through a proxy redirector. The proxy redirector sends that request to various proxy caches ("control node") to fulfill the

request. If the proxy cache does not contain the object then the proxy cache requests the object from the origin server ("storage node"). The object is then cached in the proxy cache. The proxy cache selected to cache the object is not fixed, but can be based upon such parameters as least-loaded, round-robin, arbitrary, or random (see Col 7 Lines 43-45 and Col 15 Lines 14-16).

- B) As to claims 14, 15, and 30, the selecting is performed by a level 4 switch (see Col 6 Lines 26-27) that performs load balancing (see Col 7 Lines 43-45 and Col 15 Lines 14-16).
- C) As to claims 16 and 31, the proxy caches (see Fig 1 Ref 115, 110-1, 110-2, and 117) can be called "distributed object storage managers" since they are distributed across a network and manage the storage of the cached objects.
- D) As to claim 17, a switch does perform the selecting and is capable of prioritizing the protocol traffic (see Col 6 Line 21 to Col 7 Line 48).
- E) As to claim 18, the selecting of the various control nodes can be based upon availability (see Col 7 Lines 43-45 and Col 15 Lines 14-16).
- F) As to claims 19 and 20, the limitations have been addressed with respect to claims 13, 14, and 18 above and are rejected here similarly.
- G) As to claims 21-28, the limitations have been addressed with respect to claims 13-20 above and are rejected here similarly.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3/27/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-
6. Applicant argues that Cohen et al. does not teach selecting a different proxy cache for the same object in subsequent requests. That once a TCP connection is made the same proxy cache is used for the requests (see P 7 Lines 2-15 of Amendment). This is correct, however, a different proxy cache can be selected upon different TCP connections. The system of Cohen et al. is intended for a web based system (note references to HTTP protocol and GET requests). In web based systems once a TCP connection is made it is not maintained indefinitely. An example given by Cohen et al. is making a connection to www.yahoo.com for an object (e.g. promo1.gif file). If a TCP connection is made to www.yahoo.com for this object the TCP connection is not maintained, it is closed after the request has been satisfied. If this object is requested again an hour later, a new TCP connection will be established to www.yahoo.com for the object. This new connection would then be the "subsequent request". As argued by the Examiner previously, Cohen et al. sets forth three ways to select the proxy cache. These three ways are either least-loaded, round-robin, or based upon IP address. Obviously one could not select a proxy cache based upon least-loaded and IP address or round-robin and IP address. These are exclusive of each other. Cohen et al. emphasizes this again at Col 15 Lines 13-16, "At step 302, proxy redirector selects a proxy cache based on a load balancing algorithm or on an arbitrary or random selection." Since Cohen et al. can select a proxy cache based upon a load balancing algorithm or round-robin, system can select a different proxy cache to store the same object.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin L. Ellis whose telephone number is 571-272-4205. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 6:00AM-2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-4210. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kevin L. Ellis
Primary Examiner
June 20, 2006

